

Remarks

Status of application

Claims 1-67 were examined and stand rejected in view of prior art, as well as stand rejected for technical issues. The claims have been amended to further clarify Applicant's invention. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The invention

Applicant's invention comprises a system providing improved methods for identifying matching or potentially matching names based on configurable search criteria. The solution will suggest matching names even if the names have been deliberately changed, translated, truncated, or otherwise disguised. A "fuzzy", pattern-matching methodology is used in which specified values (e.g., names) are evaluated to determine whether they match values stored in lists (e.g., names in watch lists). Based on this evaluation, a "score" is determined which represents the degree of similarity between the compared names or values. Names that are more similar to each other (e.g., have a greater number of matching characters) result in a higher percentage score. In one embodiment, the solution reports transactions above a pre-selected score threshold as a potential match, enabling a user to then further investigate the names and/or transactions involving the matching names in more detail.

General

A. Claims Pending in Action

The Examiner states in paragraph 1 of the Office Action that claims 1-30 are pending. Applicant respectfully believes that this is a typographical error as claims 1-67 are pending and the Examiner has referenced claims 1-67 in subsequent paragraphs of the Office Action.

B. Section 112, second paragraph rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 20 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant's claims 20 and 44

have been amended in an effort to more clearly articulate the claimed features of generating two codes for each word of a name, with each code representing different pronunciations of the name. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that in view of the above-mentioned amendments, the rejection of Applicant's claims 20 and 44 under Section 112 as being indefinite is overcome.

C. Section 101 rejection

Claims 1-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 on the basis of non-statutory subject matter. Here, the Examiner states that Applicant's claimed invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 25 and 47 merely claims non-functional descriptive material and that the claimed invention does not produce useful, concrete and tangible results. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 25 to include claim limitations of displaying to the user matching names having a score above an established threshold. In addition, Applicant's claim 47 includes claim limitations of reporting matches to the user if the score calculated for a particular name and a suspect name exceeds a threshold. Applicant respectfully believes these independent claims, as amended, include useful, concrete and tangible results of displaying or reporting matching names having scores indicating a degree of matching that is above an established threshold. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that in view of the above-mentioned amendments, the rejection of Applicant's claims 1-67 under Section 101 on the basis of non-statutory subject matter is overcome.

Prior art rejections

The Examiner has indicated that claims 6-7, 30-31, 61-62 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended the claims to incorporate the features which the Examiner has already indicated to be allowable over the art. More particularly, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 by adding the limitations of claim 6 and intervening claim 2 so as to include in amended claim 1 those features which the Examiner has indicated are allowable over the art. Applicant has canceled dependent claims 2 and 6 and has

amended dependent claims 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 based on these amendments.

Applicant has also amended independent claim 25 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 30 and intervening claim 26 so as to incorporate the features the Examiner has indicated to be allowable into this independent claim. Claims 26 and 30 have been canceled and dependent claims 27, 31, 32, and 34 have been amended to reflect the amendments to claim 25.

In addition, Applicant has amended independent claim 47 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 61 so as to incorporate the features the Examiner has indicated to be allowable into independent claim 47. Claim 61 has been canceled and claim 62 has been amended based on the amendment to claim 47.

Applicant's amended claims are believed to distinguish over the art because, for example, the prior art of record does not include the claim limitations of calculating a score based upon combinations of words of the particular name and words of names in the list to which the particular name is being compared in which the score is calculated based, at least in part, upon the number of matching characters in words of the respective names being compared. These features are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the prior art references, either alone or in combination. For example, the Hermansen et al. (US Patent 6,963,871) and Stretton (USPA Pub. 2006/0095368 A1) references cited by the Examiner do not include these features of calculating a score based upon number of matching characters of the words being compared.

Based on the above-described amendments, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 25 and 47, and all dependent claims thereof, are now in condition for allowance.

Any dependent claims not explicitly discussed are believed to be allowable by virtue of dependency from Applicant's independent claims, as discussed in detail above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and the amendment to the claims, it is believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Hence, it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue at an early date.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 925 465 0361.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2007

/G. Mack Riddle/

G. Mack Riddle; Reg. No. 55,572
Attorney of Record

925 465 0361
925 465 8143 FAX